

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated March 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by Shimizu '951 (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,951); and rejected claims 3, 6, and 8, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Shimizu '951.

By this Amendment, claims 1-6 have been amended to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter, claims 7-8 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and new independent claim 9 has been added. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-6 and 9 will remain pending in the patent application, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide copies of the considered and initialed PTO-1449 forms associated with the two IDSs submitted on June 30 and October 25, 2004 as well as acknowledge receipt of certified copies of the priority application JP 2004-340955 filed on November 7, 2001, perfecting the claim of foreign priority, under 35 USC §119.

Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) for the following reasons:

II. Prior Art Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) & §103(a).

As indicated above, independent claim 1, as amended, positively recites the use of a first skip processor configured to cause skipping, when the skip key is pressed a first time, of the reproduction of the image information by the reproduction processor for a first predetermined period that takes into account a delay in the first time pressing of the skip key and resuming the reproduction of the image information by the

reproduction processor after the first predetermined period has lapsed. Claim 1 also positively recites the use of a second skip processor configured to cause skipping, when the skip key is pressed two times within a certain period, of the reproduction of the image information by the reproduction processor for the first predetermined period and a second predetermined period, which is longer than the first predetermined period, and resuming the reproduction of the image information by the reproduction processor after the first predetermined period and the second predetermined period have lapsed.

These features are amply supported by the embodiments disclosed in the written description. (See, Specification: page 14, line 21 – page 17, line 9; FIG. 2). For example, as noted in the written description, there may be a delay in depressing the skip key to skip an undesired portion of a reproduction (e.g., commercial). The first predetermined time period takes such a delay into account, so that the skip duration does not spill over into a desired portion of the reproduction.

In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, the Shimizu '951 reference fails to teach the combination of features recited in claim 1, including the limitations identified above. Specifically, Shimizu '951 discloses that if the skip is instructed, information for a set time (e.g., 60 seconds) is skipped. At a step S9, the reproduction address map is corrected by the address corresponding to the information for 60 seconds based on the skip reproduction mode set at the step S4. Thereafter, the program proceeds to the step S10 and ends in accordance with the determination at the step S10. (See, Shimizu '951, col. 4, lines 57-63; FIG. 2). Shimizu '951 further discloses that it is possible to increase the period of the skipping by depressing the push button two times, so that information for 120 seconds is skipped, and the reproduction address map is updated based on the information after 120 seconds. (See, Shimizu '951, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 3; FIG. 2).

In so doing, the Shimizu '951 reference merely teaches what has been disclosed in the present written description as conventional skip processing and suffers from the very problems the presently claimed invention is directed to solving. (See e.g., Specification: page 13, lines 2-13). In other words, the Shimizu '951 skip time is set to

a single predetermined value (e.g., 60 sec.) that is multiplied by the number of times the skip button is depressed. As such, there is nothing in Shimizu '951 that remotely teaches or suggests, when the skip key is pressed a first time, skipping the reproduction of the image information by the reproduction processor for *a first predetermined period that takes into account a delay in the first time pressing of the skip key*, as required by claim 1. Nor is there anything that suggests, when the skip key is pressed twice within a certain period, skipping the reproduction of the image information by the reproduction processor for *the first predetermined period and a second predetermined period, which is longer than the first predetermined period*, as also required by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the Shimizu '951 reference cannot anticipate nor render obvious claim 1 and, therefore, respectfully request the immediate withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). In addition, because claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, claims 2-5 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Shimizu '951 and the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of these claims is respectfully requested.

Moreover, because independent claims 6 and 9 recite similar patentable features as noted with respect to claim 1, Shimizu '951 cannot anticipate nor render obvious claims 6 and 9 for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 1, and the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of these claims is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion.

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's Counsel remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains at issue in

which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the Undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number **033975**. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**



E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703 770.7788
Fax No. 703 770.7901

Date: June 19, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900